

State of California  
Department of Water Resources  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Health Services

**2002 RECYCLED WATER TASK FORCE**

**FUNDING / CALFED COORDINATION WORKGROUP  
MINUTES OF 8 JULY 2002 MEETING**

**MEETING TIME AND LOCATION**

Monday 8 July 2002, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Room 1730, Cal/EPA Building, 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California. Some of the participants joined the meeting by phone or videoconference.

**ATTENDANCE**

Fethi BenJemaa	Department of Water Resources
Kevin Booker	Sonoma County Water Agency
Rich Breitenbach	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Gohring	CALFED Bay-Delta Program
Bill Jacoby	San Diego County Water Authority
Luana Kiger	Department of Water Resources, Office of Water Use Efficiency
Phil Knapik	El Dorado Irrigation District
Nancy Lee	California State Water Resources Control Board
Richard Mills	California State Water Resources Control Board
Cheryl Muñoz	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Wayne Pierson	California State Water Resources Control Board
Melanie Richardson	Assistant Operation Officer, Santa Clara Valley Water Authority
Diana Robles	California State Water Resources Control Board
Ruben Robles	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Tracy Slavin	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
Frances Spivy-Weber	Executive Director, Mono Lake Committee
Meena Westford	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
Bob Whitley	President, WaterReuse Association, California Section
David Witter	El Dorado Irrigation District
Patrick Wright	Executive Director, CALFED Bay-Delta Program

**SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

The meeting was opened by a brief self-introduction of all the attendees and a welcoming statement by Diana Robles, the Workgroup co-chair and the Chief of the Office of Water Recycling of the State Water Resources Control Board. Thereafter, the Chair of the Workgroup, Patrick Wright, conducted the meeting through a preset agenda (a copy is

attached) starting with a discussion on the purpose and objectives of the Funding / CALFED Coordination Workgroup.

### **Workgroup Purpose and Objectives**

There was a general consensus that the purpose of the Funding/CALFED Coordination Workgroup would be to focus on issues related to funding of water recycling projects; pull together a more comprehensive picture on funding with a better handle on state and federal as well as local contributions; identify key issues and obstacles and search for alternative solutions to streamline funding for recycling projects and coordinate the efforts of various agencies involved.

### **Constraints, Obstacles and Issues of Concern**

A number of constraints and obstacles were identified mainly:

1. The lack of a stable source of funding which negatively affects project planning - a crucial step toward a successful project. One proposed solution consists of creating a backlog of eligible water recycling projects even prior to having the funds available. This can be done through RFP's and will also serve as a way to show the need and the existing demand so as to justify fund solicitation.
2. Some previously funded projects did not deliver or fell short of attaining the promised goals. It has been suggested that a better tracking and accountability should be put in place and more review of project deliverables should be followed. However, some members warned that too many levels of review, especially up front (prior to funding), become obstacles and suggested more streamlining of such reviews. Hence, while applying more penalties and accountability at the back-end, obstacles up front should be minimized.
3. The lack of a comprehensive handle of various sources of funding for water recycling. Some background work needs to be carried out to develop basic information on funding including eligibility criteria and funding sources at the federal, state and local levels. According to figures from the CALFED Record of Decision, local contributions account for about half of the Water Use Efficiency funds category under which the recycling projects are classified. Recycling projects can be made more competitive for state and federal dollars against other programs by showing the significant local contributions along with the benefits of such projects. Furthermore, funding figures shown are misleading as the totals include not only the local contributions but also the loans, which once paid back are nothing but local contributions.
4. The need to consider all the benefits of water recycling projects including direct and indirect benefits not only at the local level but on a regional scale as well as statewide. This will justify more avenues for funding and alleviate locals from having to pay the full cost for projects that have regional and statewide benefits.

Benefits include; environmental benefits, reliability and drought proof feature, new water aspect...

5. The need to streamline the funding process, including the streamlining of reviews and accountability. In this context, it was proposed that a web site be created to combine various sources of funding and information on the funding process.
6. The need to broaden the scope of funding to include construction, planning, environmental work and education and outreach.
7. Consider the existing tendency toward regional approaches to water recycling such as the cases of southern California and the Bay area. However, it has been signaled that such tendency should not overshadow other projects that might be eligible for funding outside the regional approach.

### **Research Assignments**

Four principal issues were identified where background development and in-depth research are needed. Research assignments were therefore given to different sub-groups as follow:

1. Gather basic information on funding for water recycling projects and develop a better handle on the process and sources of funding
2. Identify direct and indirect benefits of recycling project
3. Front-end streamlining of funding process and eligibility criteria (also consider regional approach)
4. Back-end effectiveness and accountability

### **Milestones and Due Dates**

The following tentative schedule was proposed to be adopted toward the elaboration of the workgroup's white paper due for presentation to the Task Force during its November 19<sup>th</sup> 2002 meeting:

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| ▫ 12 July 2002 | Brief progress report to the full Task Force by Diana Robles |
| ▫ 31 July 2002 | Circulate annotated outlines on assigned specific issues     |
| ▫ 20 Aug. 2002 | Second Workgroup meeting, preliminary draft papers           |
| ▫ 30 Aug. 2002 | Submit draft papers on specific issues to Diana Robles       |
| ▫ 12 Sep. 2002 | Expert in-depth presentation(s) to the full Task Force       |

- 20 Sep. 2002      Circulate Draft White paper
- 30 Sep. 2002      Third Workgroup meeting
- 25 Oct. 2002      Circulate final draft white paper
- 19 Nov. 2002      Present white paper to the full Task Force

8/20/2002

## **Meeting Agenda**

Funding / CALFED Coordination Workgroup  
First Meeting: Monday July 8, 2002, at 10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
Cal/EPA Building, Room 1730  
1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

- I.      Workgroup Member Introduction (10:05 – 10:20)
- II.     Discussion on Purpose/Objective of Workgroup (10:20 – 10:50)
  - A.    Obstacles to funding of water recycling projects,
  - B.    Coordination with CALFED necessary to insure funded projects meet CALFED's goals as well as those of statewide stakeholder
- III.    Agreement on Research Assignments/Identification of Actual Case Studies: (10:50 – 11:10)
  - ◆    Past and Current Obstacles to Funding Appropriated to Water Recycling Funding Programs
  - ◆    Past and Current Obstacles to Informing Potential Funding Recipients of Available Funding
  - ◆    Past and Current Obstacles to obtaining identified funding for water recycling projects/research
  - ◆    Past and Current Obstacles to proper coordination with CALFED
- IV.    Schedule of Workgroup Milestones and Milestone Due Dates (11:10 – 11:20)
- V.     Due Date for preliminary research information to be provided to Workgroup (11:20 – 11:30)
- VI.    Summarize Workgroup Presentation to Update Task Force at July 12, 2002 Meeting (11:30 – 11:45)
- VII.   Public Comments (11:45 – 11:55)
- VIII.   Schedule Next Workgroup Meeting (11:55 – 12:00)  
(The second Workgroup meeting will focus on the researching of alternative solutions to the obstacles identified in the research assignments)